

HUMAN RELATIONS and COMMUNICATION

AN INSTITUTE

**For Executives and Board Members of
Agencies Serving Blind and Visually
Impaired Persons in Region I**

HN91
Ex 31
1969

Atlantic City, New Jersey

March 1969



M.C. MIGEL MEMORIAL LIBRARY
American Foundation for the Blind
15 West 16th Street, New York, New York
10011

c.13

HUMAN RELATIONS AND COMMUNICATION

AN INSTITUTE
For Executives and Board Members of
Agencies Serving Blind and Visually
Impaired Persons in Region I

LEADER: DR. JAMES R. DUMPSON
Dean, School of Social Work,
Fordham University, New York City, N.Y.

Sheraton-Deauville Hotel
Atlantic City, New Jersey
March 27-29, 1969

Sponsored By
AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND
15 West 16th Street
New York, N.Y. 10011

Hw 91
at 31
1964
copy three

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Planning Committee	I
Program	II
First Session:	
The Communication Process: Basic Concepts	1
Second Session:	
Communication with Clients as it Relates to their Role in Decision Making	3
Third Session:	
Communication with Legislative Decision Makers	6
Fourth Session:	
a. Interaction between Agencies based on a paper "Planning by Social Agencies"	9
b. Communication: Public Awareness of Agency Services	10
 <u>Appendix</u>	
A. Paper Presented at the Twelfth International Conference of Social Work - "Planning By Social Agencies" by Dean James R. Dumpson	12
B. List of Participants	21

PLANNING COMMITTEE

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TITLE AND AGENCY</u>
Donald W. Flynn, Chairman	President Rhode Island Association for the Blind Providence, Rhode Island

MEMBERS

Clophos F. Bulleigh	Executive Director Buffalo Association for the Blind Buffalo, New York
Joseph Kohn	Executive Director State of New Jersey Commission for the Blind Newark, New Jersey
C. Owen Pollard	Director Division of Eye Care and Special Services Augusta, Maine
Gale N. Stickler	Executive Director New Hampshire Association for the Blind Concord, New Hampshire
A. Marie Morrison Regional Consultant	Coordinator American Foundation for the Blind New York, New York

PROGRAM

AN INSTITUTE FOR
ADMINISTRATORS AND BOARD MEMBERS

Sheraton-Deauville Hotel
Atlantic City, New Jersey
March 27-29, 1969

Theme: HUMAN RELATIONS AND COMMUNICATION

Institute Leader: Dr. James R. Dumpson, Dean, School of Social
Work, Fordham University, New York City, N.Y.

THURSDAY, March 27

- 4:00- 6:00 PM - Registration - Hotel Lobby
Mrs. Helen Worden
- 8:00- 9:00 PM - General Session - Regency Room
Chairman - Donald Flynn
Recorder - Gale Stickler
- Introductions - Mrs. Doris P. Sausser
- The Communication Process: Basic Concepts
Dean James R. Dumpson
- 9:15 PM - Reception - Riviera Room

FRIDAY, March 28

- 9:00- 9:30 AM - Registration - Hotel Lobby
Mrs. Helen Worden
- 9:30-10:30 AM - General Session - Regency Room
Chairman - Joseph Kohn
Recorder - Miss Eunice L. Kenyon
- Communication with Clients as it Relates
to Their Role in Decision Making
Dean James R. Dumpson
- 10:30-10:45 AM - Coffee Break - Riviera Room
- 10:45-12:00 PM - Group Discussion - Regency Room
- 12:00- 2:00 PM - Lunch



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

<https://archive.org/details/humanrelationsco00jame>

FRIDAY, March 28 (Cont'd)

- 2:00- 3:00 PM - General Session
Chairman - Jack C. Loadman
Recorder - Mrs. Helen Worden
- Communication with Legislative Decision Makers
Dean James R. Dumpson
- 3:00- 3:15 PM - Break
- 3:15- 4:30 PM - Group Discussion

SATURDAY, March 29

- 9:00-10:00 AM - General Session - Regency Room
Chairman - Clophos F. Bulleigh
Recorder - Mrs. Helen Worden
- Interaction Between Agencies:
Presentation and discussion of a paper
Planning By Social Agencies by Dean James R. Dumpson
Prepared for the International Conference of Social Work
- 10:00-10:15 AM - Coffee Break - Riviera Room
- 10:15-11:15 AM - Communication: Public Awareness of Agency Services
Mrs. Patricia Smith
- 11:15-12:15 PM - Summary
Dean James R. Dumpson
- 12:15-12:30 PM - Evaluation
Miss A. Marie Morrison
- 12:30 PM - Adjourn

GENERAL SESSION

8:00-9:00 PM - March 27, 1969

Chairman: Donald W. Flynn
Introductions: Mrs. Doris P. Sausser
Recorder: Gale N. Stickler

Mr. Donald Flynn, Institute Chairman, opened the third Administrative Institute of Region I by extending a warm welcome to all participants and expressing appreciation to the American Foundation for the Blind for its sponsorship.

Chairman Flynn introduced the Planning Committee members and recorders for the Institute, as well as Miss Marie Morrison, Regional Consultant, and Mrs. Doris Sausser, Director, Community Services Division, American Foundation for the Blind.

Mrs. Doris Sausser, at the request of the Chairman, introduced Dr. James Dumpson as the Institute leader. Dr. Dumpson is the Dean of the School of Social Work at Fordham University. He has an outstanding background in the field of Social Welfare, having held many responsible positions including being the Commissioner of the New York City Welfare Department.

Dr. Dumpson has served on a number of national committees and as a consultant to several foreign governments. He has also authored several books and a number of articles pertaining to the field of Social Welfare.

THE COMMUNICATION PROCESS: BASIC CONCEPTS

8:00-9:00 PM - March 27, 1969

Chairman: Donald W. Flynn
Leader: Dr. James R. Dumpson
Recorder: Gale N. Stickler

Dr. Dumpson introduced the subject of communication as a process in which we, as administrators and board members, must all be involved. He outlined the objectives of the administrative institute briefly as follows:

1. An attempt to stimulate creative thinking by administrators and board members regarding the communication process.

2. Consideration of this process as it relates to each individual's particular job responsibilities.
3. Expanding the relationship of communication concepts to broader areas of agency function and concern.

The primary thesis which Dr. Dumpson deftly referred to throughout this session was that communication is an essential ingredient of good administration, and communication, like good administration, is based on sound, effective human relationships.

Communication was defined as a goal-directed process whereby one person/group makes his/their ideas known to others for the purpose of influencing attitudes, opinions, and actions.

The communication process consists of four principle ingredients which were listed as the source or communicator; the message to be communicated; the channel through which communication is effected; and the receiver or audience toward whom communication is directed. It was further noted that each of these major areas contained within them numerous factors which will influence the process. For example, the communications skills, attitudes, base of knowledge, social and other systems, as well as cultural background, etc. of the source or communicator will affect the communications process. It was pointed out that these same variables must be considered in terms of the receiver towards whom the process is directed. In addition, the message to be communicated will be affected by elements of its structure, content, language or medium to be used, etc. The process can be directed toward all or any combination of sensory channels which were enumerated as hearing, seeing, touching, smelling, and tasting.

To more clearly delineate the conceptual frame of reference utilized by Dr. Dumpson, the basic components of the communication process and their variables are outlined in the table below.

<u>Source</u>	<u>Message</u>	<u>Channel</u>	<u>Receiver</u>
<u>Comm. Skills</u>	<u>Elements</u>	<u>Seeing</u>	<u>Comm. Skills</u>
<u>Attitudes</u>	<u>Structure</u>	<u>Hearing</u>	<u>Attitudes</u>
<u>Knowledge</u>	<u>Content</u>	<u>Touching</u>	<u>Knowledge</u>
<u>Social System</u>	<u>Language or Medium</u>	<u>Smelling</u>	<u>Social System</u>
<u>Culture</u>	<u>Terminology</u>	<u>Tasting</u>	<u>Culture</u>

Dr. Dumpson summarized the relationships and interactions between the factors in the above table as essentially - who says what in what way through what channels so that the receiver is in-

fluenced in accordance with the desired goal. This, essentially, is the goal of the process.

Good communications are based on sound principles of human relations. Dr. Dumpson illustrated how human relations can be violated by inquiring of institute participants if they had ever heard statements such as "why don't people listen," "no one told me," "I wasn't consulted," "why doesn't someone tell me." These or similar statements are a reflection that the communication process is not functioning properly. Poor interpersonal relationships may be a causative factor. It was pointed out that people sometimes listen but do not "hear", which is indicative of something amiss between the communicator and the receiver.

Defective communications can be the result of many factors; for example, the communicator may not be talking in terms of the listener - perhaps there are differences in values; there may exist an organizational distance between a communicator and a receiver which may create a gap in the process or perhaps this may be a reflection of what was termed "protective screening" - reporting back only what you know the other person wants to hear. The essence of communication is the development of mutual understanding.

Dr. Dumpson concluded his remarks by pointing out several steps that can be taken to improve the process of communication. They are:

1. Assess periodically with receivers how they feel about the communication system and how they would suggest it be improved.
2. Evaluate the content or message in terms of the impact it has on the receiver and the extent to which it accomplishes the desired goal.
3. Review the communications system to insure that all channels are open and being utilized.
4. Elimination of obstacles or "bottlenecks" which may be affecting the communication process.

Communication is the process through which administration makes things happen - or perhaps not happen!

COMMUNICATION WITH CLIENTS AS IT RELATES
TO THEIR ROLE IN DECISION MAKING

9:30-10:30 AM - March 28, 1969

Chairman: Joseph Kohn
Leader: Dean James R. Dumpson
Recorder: Eunice L. Kenyon

Mr. Joseph Kohn, chairman of this session, welcomed the

group. He referred to the fact that one problem in considering our clients taking a role in decision making is that we serve many children and adults so severely handicapped that one wonders if such persons are in a position to participate in decisions. We must realize that communication is not just intellectual. The average person we deal with speaks simply and doesn't understand complicated language and thoughts.

Mr. Kohn then turned the meeting over to Dean Dumpson who continued in the same vein. When we speak to people across cultures of any sort, they don't understand us. Cultural differences, when not understood and allowed for, prevent real communication.

Relating this to our scheme of conceptual frame of reference, (See 3/27/69, 8 P.M., Session Minutes, p.) regarding the message, code is the language, including its idioms. We must use a code understandable to the receiver. Regarding the channel, physical contact may be effective in saying "I accept you, I like you. I'm willing to meet you on your terms." The receiver has exactly the same characteristics as the source. How these characteristics vary between the two are important considerations in communication.

Dean Dumpson then stated our basic premise. "People have a right to participate in those decisions that affect their lives. Clients have a right to be involved in policy decisions that affect their lives." People sometimes wonder why we arrange supervision for social workers, so that they always have someone with whom to seek consultation (when a physician completes his training and goes about his work of treating people without supervision.) Dean Dumpson stated that the worst thing the doctor can do is kill you, but more serious may be the social crippling that can affect a person for life. For example, think of the impact on a child's life of the decision to place him for adoption. Because we do make these kinds of decisions, somehow those for whom we help make the decisions must have a part as appropriate.

Clients have a right to be involved, either as volunteers or workers, in programs that affect their lives. The agency has a responsibility to select and train clients in skills necessary for such work.

The basis of our premise is our new perception of people, particularly those in need of service. Under the Economic Opportunity Act we find the phrase "maximum feasible participation." This leads to a new framework as the poor can participate in certain ways and make a real contribution to finding exits out of poverty. There is nothing inherently inferior about people in need of services, either tangible or intangible.

People we serve can assume new roles in life, provided we give them the climate and resources for taking on these roles.

How do we make these thoughts operational in the functions of an agency-policy formation, service delivery, staffing, fund raising, evaluation, and planning. Dean Dumpson next proceeded to discuss how client involvement might be carried out in each.

In policy determination, one of the best ways a client can participate is for us to evaluate the client's response (or lack of it) to the agency's service. How does that response get to the agency? -- through effective communication. To observe this, the client must become the source and the agency the receiver. If this gets into the policy making process, the client is involved. Dean Dumpson stated that having clients on boards is the most superficial way of having them involved in the policy making process.

In service delivery, the client's reaction as the user should be the ultimate determinant. Instead, service delivery is pretty much structured to suit the convenience of the agency, the staff, and the board. Structuring agency services in terms of agency need as the board may feel, is not at all relevant to the needs of the client. For example, how do we get into the ghetto? These are people who do not have middle class standards. Agencies don't locate themselves in the ghettos. We sound as if we are saying, "We haven't listened to you. We haven't asked you what you want, but we have a service. Come and get it." We haven't heard the clients tell us about the need for availability and accessibility of service. Some people can't come for service between 9 A.M. and 5 P.M. Service delivery should be structured to meet the need of the users.

In staff selection -- clients have a right of input into selection of staff. They know a lot about their needs, cultural differences, etc. They want people who can identify, who are aware of their problems. They want someone who can put into decision making their particular needs. Communication is the medium through which this kind of input gets into the decision making process. We need to find out how clients feel about the staff of the agency. In funding, we usually feel that clients can't participate unless it's a fee charging agency. The opportunity of participating should be offered as it bolsters their self-image if they feel they are participating in an important community project. Encouraging client interpretation of agency needs is another way of involving them in this function.

Clients can serve on program evaluation teams. They can help with surveys of accessibility, availability, and in predicting needs. Clients can be represented in the self-study process. Clients are the final determinants of the effectiveness of our service.

Clients can be involved in the political and social actions of an agency. Every agency should have a social action function. Those socio-economic experiences which contribute to their coming to a particular agency should be the focus of an agency's social actions.

Our accountability to recipients of services is often overlooked.

Following Dean Dumpson's presentation was a lively discussion which proved he had been truly communicating.

COMMUNICATION WITH LEGISLATIVE DECISION MAKERS

2:00-3:00 PM - March 28, 1969

Chairman - Jack C. Loadman
Leader - Dean James R. Dumpson
Panel - Mr. Frank Johns - "The Voluntary Agency View"
 Mr. Kenneth McCollam - "The State Agency View"
 Mr. George Park - "The Organized Blind View"
Recorder - Helen Worden

Panelists were charged with giving a view of what they were attempting to achieve through legislative decision makers, what their experiences were and what results were obtained.

1. Mr. Frank Johns, Superintendent of the Oak Hill School (a voluntary residential school for blind children) in Hartford, Connecticut told about use of legislators to get a million dollars for new construction, financial aid for school personnel to become a part of the state's retirement plan and other special legislation concerning the school's program. He observed that in going to legislators, it is desirable to keep knowledgeable of what is going on. Volunteers are helpful in making an approach. His approach has been through written communication, personal contact, sending information to all legislators concerning all legislation his agency is interested in, appearances before legislative committees, use of newspaper and all other sources as mediums of communication.
2. Mr. H. Kenneth McCollam, Director of the Connecticut State Board of Education and Services for the Blind, stated that he works closely with Mr. Johns. Some of his techniques have been to invite legislators to come to visit and to provide lunch for them. His Board make-up is excellent for legislative purposes. The Governor and Chief Justice are ex officio members. Six members are appointed by the Governor. Two must be blind and one must be a woman.

The approach to introducing a piece of legislation is as follows: There is consultation with the Legislative Council to help draw up a bill. This is presented to the legislature by the majority leader in the majority party. In this way, it goes through easier; there are no politics involved. The bill goes before the Legislative Committee and here it fights the battle of the budget. Here, there is no particular problem to getting sufficient funds. The problem is getting it past the Administrative Budget Committee. This is most difficult. Concerning new and amended statutes, Mr. McCollam stated he would make the same presentation as Mr. Johns. When public hearings are held, those interested in the bill should have as many persons present as are able to speak in favor of the bill. Supply a copy of last year's annual report to each Budget Committee member when the budget is being considered.

3. Mr. George Park, Board Manager of the New Jersey Commission of the Blind presented the approach of the organized blind. He noted state agencies cannot get involved in legislative matters. He stated private agencies have done little which has been beneficial to blind persons through legislation. He stated blind persons have accomplished what they have in New Jersey with help from no one. The organized blind also work to defeat legislation they don't like. Their method is to confer with key legislators, prior to the time a bill is coming up for consideration. When they want new legislation introduced, they have a well written bill drafted and then have an influential legislator introduce it. Their organization contacts legislators through their own group members; other civic and fraternal groups are also involved. When a client has a voice as a part of the state agency, it is "beautiful", he said.

Dean Dumpson then responded and said the major questions to be asked of us are (1) To what changes in public social policies and social institutions are you willing to give your support? and (2) What activities are you willing to engage in, in order to effect these changes?

We are apt to consider politics "dirty business" and we apologize for politics. Politics is a process in a democratic government through which public social policy is established which forms the basis on which all public and private interest rests. Therefore, the problem - Board and staff has dual responsibility (1) as a professional and (2) as a private citizen, to engage in political action and to assure wanted public policy and to integrate political action and social welfare practices.

The contributions and responsibilities we have through such involvement include:

1. The responsibility to interpret human needs - a commitment to what is good for people.
2. The responsibility to assure our value orientation is reflected in public social policy.
3. Responsibility to share our knowledge concerning techniques of communication with legislators as well as our insights into the group process as it concerns the legislative process. We should be knowledgeable of how compromises are arrived at among legislators.
4. Educational responsibility for establishing rapport with bureaucrats and the bureaucracies that run government.
5. The responsibility to establish rapport and communication with other groups interested in protection of human resources.

The Approach:

1. Define the problem clearly in our own minds.
2. Identify or establish the social policy base on which the legislation is to rest. Legislation is facilitative to goals. This is a way of achieving a way of the good life.
3. Gather facts. What are the supporting data? Service agencies have the greatest amount to contribute here (in terms of people to be helped or harmed). Social workers fail to supply facts, therefore, they fail with legislators.
4. Organize support for the position we take - both within and outside the field. Form coalitions with other groups interested in the same kind of goal.
5. Interpretation - refer to the total chart provided earlier.
6. Involve clients. This is an opportunity to get good support data.

Choices:

1. Let the government do everything.
2. Let the private agency do everything.
3. Have the two groups make a joint effort.

Should ultimate responsibility for assuring services rest with the government? Voluntary funds are displaced taxes. Can you remove the responsibility for their expenditure from government? Government sets standards.

Questions raised for consideration:

1. How broad is the voluntary agency responsibility in the legislative process?
2. How to use the power and influence available in Boards of voluntary agencies. Should we channel this and how?
3. Communication - letters are ineffective. What channels should be used to secure the action we want?
4. What kind of relations should exist between voluntary and state agencies relative to legislation? What is the first thing a governmental agency should do before having a bill drafted?
5. Take the blind to testify - should we use others to testify? Is there a resource missing?

INTERACTION BETWEEN AGENCIES: JOINT PLANNING
BASED ON A PAPER - PLANNING BY SOCIAL AGENCIES
DEAN JAMES R. DUMPSON

9:00-10:00 AM - March 29, 1969

Chairman - Clophos F. Bulleigh
Leader - Dean James R. Dumpson
Recorder - Helen W. Worden

Themes running through Dean Dumpson's paper:

1. No agency plans or functions in a vacuum. It must see its relationship to the sub-system of which it is a part.

2. Case accountability (not just financial accountability) is a requirement. Agencies must assure that an individual or family doesn't get lost in cracks between the sub-system group. We need to know what happens to a client when we refer him out for service. It is our responsibility to see what is done until no service is any longer necessary.
3. Plan for direct service plus some part of community service which is given by others (housing, health, etc., i.e. the National Society for the Prevention of Blindness).
4. Take an advocacy role on the part of clients. See to it that the client gets what is his just due - back other agencies if this becomes necessary. See to it that rules are changed if they are unfair to the client.

COMMUNICATION: PUBLIC AWARENESS OF AGENCY SERVICES
10:15 AM-12:15 PM - March 29, 1969

Speaker - Mrs. Patricia Smith of the Public Relations
staff of the American Foundation for the Blind
Recorder - Helen W. Worden

In our public relations, we should decide what we want to say, to whom we want to say it, and how we want to say it. It is good business to get a professional public relations person on the Public Relations Committee of an agency. Junior Advertising Clubs are a good resource from which to get public relations help. The National Advertising Council is also a good resource.

We need to aim our public relations material at (1) the general public, (2) professional people in social welfare and health fields, and (3) the blind people themselves. A telephone answering service when an agency is closed can be an effective public relations tool. There should be contact in print for public relations purposes at least three times a year.

SUMMARIES OF SESSIONS

Leader - Dean James R. Dumpson
Recorder - Helen W. Worden

Summaries were next given by the recorders for each session. Dean Dumpson remarked that the summaries were excellent. There should be involvement of the client in decision making, at the

service delivery area. There should be use of the client in the delivery of service itself. The use of clients as aides is an excellent service to the client, to the agency, and as a relief from the manpower crisis. Clients should be trained to be capable of certain service delivery as aides. Clients are ready and able to take on training.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS RAISED IN THE FIRST SESSION

1. How can we better communicate with ghetto people?
How do we establish communication with the ghetto in the first place?

Answer - We first need to understand the makeup of the ghetto and then to establish contact with the leadership in the ghetto. There is a definite leadership in the ghetto which the ghetto people themselves recognize. Through this leadership we can make known the services available and the assistance we would like to provide people within the ghetto. We must be prepared, however, to deliver service in accordance with the desires of the ghetto leadership. We must build a bridge with the leadership. It is a good thing to have representatives of cultural groups tied in with the agency who have first hand knowledge and contact with the ghetto.

2. How can we communicate with people so they will use our services?

Answer - It is a matter of motivation. Interpret services through public relations activities and materials focused on their level. Give thought to a neighborhood services information center at various spots throughout the community.

Paper Presented at the
TWELFTH
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK

PLANNING BY SOCIAL AGENCIES

by

JAMES R. DUMPSON
COMMISSIONER OF WELFARE
CITY OF NEW YORK

ATHENS, GREECE
SEPTEMBER 16, 1964

It is quite appropriate that a conference committed to the theme, "Social Progress Through Social Planning: The Role of Social Work" should give some attention to the application of the planning process to agencies and organizations that provide services directly to people at the local neighborhood or community level. This paper is presented as one effort in stimulating consideration and discussion of those areas and guidelines that direct services agencies might consider in the planning process that will make more effective their contribution to the well-being of people they serve.

No agency operates without some kind of planning. Its planning may be limited to determining how it will secure funds with which to exist, or how it will finance the goods and services which it offers to people who need them. The planning of the agency may, on the other hand, be limited to determining how it will perpetuate the goals and objectives of its founders. Indeed, the planning of the agency may be limited to a variety of areas, as in the examples just cited and other similar ones, that keep it isolated from priority needs of people at a given time in the life of community or from the immediate goals and objectives of the society from which, in the final analysis, it really has secured its mandate to serve. It will be noted that I have repeatedly used the word "limited" in each of these examples. Implied in my use of the word "limited" is criticism of so sterile and unproductive a concept and practice of planning illustrated in the examples.

Social planning, in its very essence, is a process that is characterized by effort toward the attainment of defined social objectives, utilizing a number of systems that lead to agreement on values, goals, and means. (1) It involves the evaluation of all possible alternatives, selection and development of the proposals, and an indication of the method and timetable for implementing and evaluating the proposals. In brief, I view planning in the social agency as policy choices relating to all its activities in the light of agreed upon values and reasonable predictions of social need. I submit that this concept of social planning is a responsibility of every agency and organization providing health and welfare services to people. Its execution as part of agency practice is required if people and the satisfaction of some aspect of their needs is to be the primary objective of social agency intervention and effort. Social planning within each agency or organization is essential if the most

(1) Report of United States Committee to XII International Conference of Social Work, Athens, Greece, Sept. 1964 p.1

economical and effective use is to be made of the philanthropic and government monies spent by those responsible for the administration of the program. It is wasteful of funds and manpower, both of which are in short supply in every country engaged in health and welfare programs, not to evaluate alternatives, not to develop proposals according to a realistic timetable, and not to identify clearly and evaluate systematically the methods of implementation as well as the effectiveness with people of the effort.

I turn now to a presentation of a number of areas that each administrator and his colleagues must take into consideration in social welfare agency planning. My use of the term "social welfare agency" throughout this paper, includes those services and facilities in the fields of health, education, welfare, housing and such others that contribute to the social development of people and their country.

Agency planning must not be done in isolation from the agency's relationship to its place in the system of social welfare of which it is a part; it must be organically related to the community's machinery for planning and coordination. Obviously I am really supporting acknowledgment of the need in every community for some structure that has as its primary function the identification of social welfare needs and, within the value system of the community, the establishment of indicated, broad program proposals for members of the system with timetables for implementation of the proposals. With industrial and technological change, which every country is experiencing in varying degrees, come new and social problems and social needs in addition to those already present and unsolved. This emphasizes the requirement that priorities be adjusted if social intervention is to be effective.

Whether the planning and coordinating structure be a voluntary or non-governmental council or whether it be the government's social planning structure is less important within the context of this discussion. What is important is that the individual agency or welfare organization relate to and define its role in planning to some overall assessment of current need and program development. This is essential if the individual agency is to avoid duplication in the provision of its services, if it is to be flexible in adjusting to changing needs, and if it is to have a meaningful relationship to appropriate agencies in the system insofar as its own accountability for the families and individuals it attempts to serve is concerned. The five year plans of many countries, while not always reflecting the desired participation in its development of local community agencies, frequently provide the assessment of national needs and indicate national goals and priorities that may well form the basis for local community assessment, goal determination,

and agency program development. But even when this process has been followed at the national level, there still remains for the local community, preferably on a city-wide or district-wide level the obligation to translate the national assessment and program proposals into terms that are relevant to and meaningful for the city or district and the people who live in it. Planning for the agency or organization then becomes a refinement of the needs, goals, and proposals to the specific program development of the agency or organization limited only by the definition of function mandated or elected by the agency. In brief, the agency then offers the services or provides the facilities that the system needs to have it offer or provide rather than that which pleases the administration, his contributors, sponsoring groups, or chief patron and thus may not have any relation to the agency's role in the network of existing resources.

The alternative to such a course is to decrease considerably the opportunity for services to help and to realize effective results. Agency planning that does not encompass provision of services or facilities in terms of the needs of the system of which it is a part helps assure that people who are in greatest need are helped least or not at all, or that the services and facilities are not those needed by people known to it, or that the services and facilities in a community are fragmented and organized in a piecemeal manner. When services are fragmented we can be sure that we have fragmented people. Each agency must view itself as one part of the community's system of social intervention into the lives of people. It secures its mandate to intervene either from the law if it is a government agency or from its voluntary contributors and board acting for the community if it is a non-governmental agency. In either event it is not any entity unto itself. It is part of a system responsible to the whole community, and as such must be part of, participate in, and respond to the community's structure for central planning and coordination.

Up to this point my discussion has focused on the relationship of the agency or organization to its place in the social intervention system of a community. I should like to discuss now the planning responsibility of the governmental agency that provides services and facilities in a community that also has voluntary or non-governmental agencies providing services and facilities. In my country, frequently we discuss and seek to clarify the partnership or complementary relationship and responsibilities of public (governmental) and voluntary (non-governmental) agencies. In most countries, in varying degrees, I believe, this relationship exists. Government in a democracy

has the inescapable responsibility of assuring the welfare of all its citizens. Obviously, this responsibility may be carried out in a variety of ways and their consideration is beyond the limits of concern of this discussion. However, in the field of social welfare, for the public agency which is government's instrument for social services, planning must be directed toward assuring high quality services and facilities for every one of its citizens who need assistance. If the central planning and coordinating structure to which I have referred earlier does not exist in a community or if there are areas of need not met satisfactorily at all, government through its appropriate ministries and departments has the obligation to assure that every family and individual receives the service or has access to the facility at the time he needs it. I would add, too, that more and more government initiative and leadership is required in establishing and supporting central planning and coordination of services to people. Indeed this is a first responsibility of a public agency where no central planning structure exists. Where one does exist under voluntary auspices, government participation is essential.

Government responsibility if properly fulfilled cannot admit areas of unmet needs among its people. It must assure total service coverage. This does not imply, I believe, that government must always itself establish a network of services and facilities at a given time for everyone who need them. Obviously, where there is a lag in economic development, comprehensive provisions for social development cannot always be provided by government at the time they are needed. Further, if needed services and facilities with acceptable standards are available under non-governmental auspices to all people who need them government should not duplicate them. In the first instance cited, the governmental agency must have fulfilled its obligations in planning of having identified the need, its nature, and extent, and proposed programs with timetables for implementation to meet the need. In the second instance, government may fulfill its obligation by purchasing from voluntary agencies and organizations the services and facilities people need or providing agencies with financial subsidy again with the requirement of acceptable standards and the availability of the services to all who need them. This audience might find useful the guidelines I have set forth in my own city for government purchase of services from voluntary agencies in partial fulfillment of its obligation to assure social service coverage for all. These guidelines seek to assure standards of service and protect prerogatives of each sector. They are as follows:

1. The purchase of services or facilities by government from a voluntary agency is not necessarily a substitute for provision of those services or facilities by government itself. Total coverage for all people who need services and facilities must be assured by government.
2. The voluntary agency holds in trust funds contributed to it by private philanthropy. It is morally bound to spend these funds in behalf of those in whose name and for whose circumstances and conditions it collected the funds. This obligation of voluntary agencies must be considered at all times and particularly when tax funds are being received by the agencies.
3. Government in purchasing services and facilities from voluntary agencies must pay the full cost of the care or service to the agency, less the contribution the agency can equitably provide out of its own funds.
4. Government alone, as the purchasing agency, must make the decision about the appropriateness of the services and facilities to be purchased and decide when it will and will not purchase. It cannot be merely an agent for remitting tax funds to voluntary organizations.
5. Government in purchasing services and facilities must establish the standards under which it will purchase and must be prepared to evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of the service purchased.

Implementation of these principles or guidelines required considerable joint planning between government and voluntary agencies. Each sector must examine with the other, as there must be examination within each sector of the system, of the manner in which the financial relationship between government and voluntary social welfare affects the individual and planning responsibility of each. For example, if government in purchasing services determines to place priority emphasis on one age group of the child care population based on its assessment of community need, serious dislocations can result in the system and within child welfare agencies if they have not shared in the assessment and are not prepared or refuse to address their services to the age group determined as a high priority need group by the public agency. Or, if government insists on high quality medical services and refuses to purchase service from a hospital or clinic not meeting prescribed standards, problems in community group relationships arise. Over a period of time, the non-conforming child welfare agency and the non-complying medical service may be forced involuntarily to re-focus their programs and standards or experience financial chaos

and eventually cease to exist. I do not contend that either of these results is necessarily undesirable under the circumstances cited, but the community conflict that could result involving vested interests, politics, and traditional loyalties should be avoided if at all possible. As stated previously, no agency has a right, as an instrument of community intervention in behalf of the general welfare, to exist as an entity apart from other agencies, public and voluntary. I do contend, however, that careful point planning is required to prevent the community conflict that inevitably arises when pressure from outside the agency results in involuntary change within the agency.

In addition to the need for flexibility in defining the area and content of agency services particularly when there is a government subsidy or purchase of service is the matter of case accountability. By case accountability is meant responsible assurance for high quality, appropriate case service for a family or individual at the time of need, and until such time as community standards of individual or family adequacy permit termination of agency intervention in the life of the individual or family. Implicit, also, in this concept is the avoidance of fragmentation of services to the client as he and his situation require one or more different services at the same time or successively. An individual or family may well need a multiplicity of skills and services during the period of intervention. I submit that every agency or organization must plan for case accountability, as defined here, for those clients whom it agrees to serve. When there is purchase of service or financial subsidy by government, I propose that the government agency must assume responsibility for assuring case accountability either through its own departments or by delegation to a voluntary agency for whom it has some supervisory responsibility. Here again, only the closest liaison and careful planning can assure smooth, cooperative relationship between the public and voluntary agency toward the end of effective intervention in behalf of clients.

My discussion of public-private agency relationship includes the assumption that private agencies operate under some type of government license as a protection to the citizen who utilizes the services of voluntary agencies. While licensure procedures usually include the enforcement of minimum required physical standards, fund raising and accountability for the use of funds, much more needs to be done in social welfare in most countries for the inclusion of provisions for accountability for standards and quality of service by the governmental licensing or supervising agency. For many, this may suggest a level of government control in the operation of social welfare services that is objectionable. How that control is exercised,

the kinds of sanctions that accompany it, and the use made of it by the voluntary agency depends in the first instance on how the agency perceives its role in the intervention system. In practice, too, it depends on whether the agency's concept of planning includes the various ways it will utilize its relationship to external control in order to assure the most effective realization of its objectives. The use of the financial participation of government in agency operation under the conditions I have suggested is an important policy choice for each agency, but most assuredly it involves a level of government control that properly affects agency planning.

I turn now to an aspect of social welfare agency planning that in many countries and communities is seriously neglected. Each agency, governmental and voluntary, should include in its planning ways in which it might contribute to the alteration of the systems or forces that will enable individuals and families realize their maximum potentials and themselves contribute fully to the economic and social productivity of the society. Most frequently, individuals and families require the intervention of social welfare agencies because of defects or limitations in the social or economic systems of the community or country. I refer to defects and limitations in such systems as education, health, employment, vocational training and vocational upgrading, and housing, with particular reference to racial discrimination as a barrier to self-realization in all of these systems. In every country and in every community within every country, large groups of people have experiences with those systems and their limitations and defects which contribute to apathy, hopelessness, and despair among those who are socially and economically deprived. While planning for effective services to people, social welfare agencies need to plan for making their contribution to required social change, within the value system and goals of the society of which they are a part, that will free people not only to aspire for individual and family development and progress but to make real the chance for realizing their aspirations. Specifically, I am proposing that social welfare agencies plan, as part of their social responsibility, to participate in and provide leadership for social action designed to strengthen and extend the effectiveness of those systems and forces that now because of their defects and barriers, contribute to such social problems as dependency, poverty, ill health, and ghetto living. Social welfare agencies by virtue of knowledge from their own case records and experiences with the socially and economically deprived have a unique wealth of material that point up community action required for the well-being of the total community. "It is sound public policy" states Alfred J. Kahan, "periodically to review social welfare, educational, health, and mental health services and their assignment to the 'residual-therapeutic' or the 'institutional-developmental' realms. To the extent that

needs grow out of predictable social statuses affecting substantial segments of the population, and can be defined in terms of such statuses rather than through individual diagnosis, there should be 'institutional-developmental' provision.(2) It is to this area of service provision that I advocate agency planning. Attacking and seeking to help revise social and economic practices that prevent upward mobility for all people may be a new responsibility for social welfare agencies. I submit that it is an inescapable responsibility, and planning within the agency as well as within the social intervention system requires the highest level of leadership and planning.

(2) Kahn, Alfred J. The Social Scene and the Planning of Services for Children. Social Work Vol. 7 No. 3, p.14, July 1962. National Association of Social Workers, New York.

PARTICIPANTS IN ADMINISTRATIVE INSTITUTE

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TITLE AND AGENCY</u>
Buckley, Mrs. Helen	Executive Director Glens Falls Association for the Blind Glens Falls, New York
Bulleigh, Clophos F.	Executive Director Buffalo Association for the Blind Buffalo, New York
Burck, George E.	Board Member Commission for the Blind Leonardo, New Jersey
Clock, Miss Audrey D.	Administrator Cattaraugus County Association for the Blind and Visually Handicapped Olean, New York
Concordia, Sister M.	Director St. Joseph's School for the Blind Jersey City, New Jersey
Dover, Mrs. Frances T.	Acting Administrative Director The Jewish Guild for the Blind New York, New York
Dumpson, Dr. James R.	Dean, School of Social Work Fordham University New York, New York
Flynn, Donald W.	President Rhode Island Association for the Blind Providence, Rhode Island
Franzel, Miss Adeline	Chief of Special Services Library for the Blind and Handicapped Trenton, New Jersey
Hanlon, Mrs. Gordon B.	Board Member Boston Center for Blind Children Boston, Massachusetts
Johns, Frank, Jr.	Superintendent Connecticut Institute for the Blind (Oak Hill School) Hartford, Connecticut

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TITLE AND AGENCY</u>
Kenyon, Miss Eunice L.	Executive Director Boston Center for Blind Children Boston, Massachusetts
Kohn, Joseph	Executive Director Commission for the Blind Newark, New Jersey
Loadman, Jack C.	Executive Director Massachusetts Association for the Blind Boston, Massachusetts
Macurda, William W.	Board Member New Hampshire Association for the Blind Concord, New Hampshire
Monroe, Mrs. Charles S.	Consultant to the Executive Councils Program of Services to the Blind Executive Council of the Episcopal Church New York, New York
Morrison, Miss A. Marie	Regional Consultant American Foundation for the Blind New York, New York
McCollam, H. Kenneth	Director State Board of Education and Services to the Blind Wethersfield, Connecticut
Roland, Sr. Agnes	Board Member St. Joseph's School for the Blind Jersey City, New Jersey
Rubin, Mamuel	Board Member Massachusetts Commission for the Blind Boston, Massachusetts
Sausser, Mrs. Doris P.	Director, Community Services Division American Foundation for the Blind New York, New York
Smith, Mrs. Patricia S.	Director, Information Department American Foundation for the Blind New York, New York
Stickler, Gale N.	Executive Director New Hampshire Association for the Blind Concord, New Hampshire
Worden, Mrs. Helen W.	Executive Director Rhode Island Association for the Blind Providence, Rhode Island

HN91

c.3

Ex31 AN INSTITUTE FOR EXECUTIVES
1969 AND BOARD MEMBERS OF AGENCIES
SERVING BLIND AND VISUALLY
IMPAIRED PERSONS...ATLANTIC
CITY, N.J. Date Due 1969. (n.d.)

HN91

c.3

Ex31

1969

AN INSTITUTE FOR EXECUTIVES AND
BOARD MEMBERS OF AGENCIES SERVING
BLIND AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED PER-
SONS...ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., 1969.

DATE

ISSUED TO

(n.d.)

AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND
15 WEST 16th STREET
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10011

